



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/730,682	12/06/2000	Glen Tindal	CNTW-006/00US	8202

22903 7590 06/16/2004

COOLEY GODWARD LLP
ATTN: PATENT GROUP
11951 FREEDOM DRIVE, SUITE 1700
ONE FREEDOM SQUARE- RESTON TOWN CENTER
RESTON, VA 20190-5061

EXAMINER

AKPATI, ODAICHE T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2135

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/730,682

Applicant(s)

TINDAL ET AL.

Examiner

Tracey Akpati

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4, 5, 6, 7.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis et al (5872928).

With respect to Claim 1, the limitation of “generating a configuration record for a network device” is met on column 2, lines 30-36; and “receiving general configuration information relating to a network device, the general configuration information including a device type indicator, a device manufacturer indicator, and a device name; and receiving vendor-specific; configuration information, wherein the vendor specific configuration information corresponds to the device manufacturer indicator; and generating a configuration record for the network device, the configuration record including the received general configuration information and the received vendor specific configuration information” is met on column 2, lines 26-39 and Fig. 3. The general configuration information is represented by the set of attributes, the vendor-specific information is represented by the model type.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a model type as the vendor-specific information because the network management system, ‘Spectrum’ includes a database of models and model types (column 6, lines

4-7) and Spectrum allows for collective management of networks with equipment from different vendors (column 5, lines 29-31). Hence the model type is a vendor-specific information.

Also, the list of attributes can be found in Fig. 3 in the configuration record. This list of attributes in Fig. 3 discloses attributes such as those listed in the limitation above such as: device type indicator and device name and furthermore makes an attribute such as a device manufacturer indicator obvious because it falls within the same category of the listed attributes defining the network device.

With respect to Claim 2, the limitation of “receiving common information model (CIM) data” is met by the applicant’s specification on page 18 and 19, on paragraph 44. The applicant discloses CIM data items, which are defined in the CIM Specification v2.2 and Schema v2.4 as well known in the art.

With respect to Claim 3, the limitation of “generating device-specific configuration commands for the network device associated with the configuration record” is met on column 3, lines 60-66.

With respect to Claim 4, the limitation of “including at least an indication of the generated device-specific configuration commands with the generated configuration record” is met on Figure 3 and on column 4, lines 14-19.

With respect to Claim 5, the limitation of “wherein the at least an indication of the device specific configuration commands comprises a pointer to a storage address where the device-specific configuration records are stored” is obvious over Figure 3.

With respect to Claim 6, the limitation of “receiving at least an indication of a data dump, the data dump being generated by the network device; and storing the at least an indication of the data dump in the configuration record associated with the network device” is obvious over column 4, lines 51-67 and on column 5, lines 1-5 and Fig. 3. The information collected from processing information from the network entities such as a computer devices represents the data dump. Figure 3 shows the configuration record depicting different data stored and their status/value.

With respect to Claim 7, the limitation of “retrieving the vendor-specific configuration information from a remote storage system that is associated with a vendor” is met on column 5, lines 25-31 and on column 6, lines 2-9 and on Fig. 1. The vendor-specific configuration information is stored in Spectrum (which is the network management system) and can be retrieved remotely through the communication link.

With respect to Claim 8, the limitation of “storing the generated configuration record in a central repository configured to store a plurality of configuration records” is met on column 3, lines 45-59 and column 4, lines 9-13.

With respect to Claim 9, the limitation of “a general configuration data module for storing general information” is met on column 6, lines 7-28; and “a vendor-specific data module for storing vendor-specific information” on column 5, lines 29-31 and column 6, lines 4-7; and “a configuration command data module for storing data associated with device-specific configuration commands, for the network device” on column 3, lines 60-67 and on column 4, lines 1-8.

With respect to Claim 10, the limitation of “wherein the general configuration data module is configured to store CIM (common information model) data” is met by the applicant’s specification on page 18 and 19, on paragraph 44. The applicant discloses CIM data items, which are defined in the CIM Specification v2.2 and Schema v2.4 as well known in the art.

With respect to Claim 11, the limitation of “wherein the configuration command data module is configured to store a pointer to a storage location containing the device-specific configuration commands corresponding to the network device” is obvious over Figure 3.

With respect to Claim 12, the limitation of “wherein the configuration command data module is configured to store device-specific configuration commands” is met on column 3, lines 60-66.

With respect to Claim 13, the limitation of “stored in a central repository for storing a plurality of data configuration records” is met on column 3, lines 46-49.

With respect to Claim 14, the limitation of “at least a first processor; and at least a first memory device electronically connected with the at least a first processor” is met inherently on column 2, lines 9-25; and “a plurality of instructions stored on the at least a first memory device” is inherently met by Fig. 7; and “receive general configuration information relating to a network device, the general configuration information including a device type indicator, a device manufacturer indicator, and a device name; receive vendor-specific configuration information, wherein the vendor specific configuration information corresponds to the device manufacturer indicator; and generate a configuration record for the network device, the configuration record including the received general configuration information and the received vendor specific configuration information” is obvious over column 2, lines 26-39 and Fig. 3.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a model type as the vendor-specific information because the network management system, ‘Spectrum’ includes a database of models and model types (column 6, lines 4-7) and Spectrum allows for collective management of networks with equipment from different vendors (column 5, lines 29-31). Hence the model type is a vendor-specific information.

Also, the list of attributes can be found in Fig. 3 in the configuration record. This list of attributes in Fig. 3 discloses attributes such as those listed in the limitation above such as: device type indicator and device name and furthermore makes an attribute such as a device manufacturer indicator obvious because it falls within the same category of the other disclosed attributes defining the network device.

With respect to Claim 15, the limitation of “wherein the general configuration information comprises common information model (CIM) data” is met by the applicant’s specification on page 18 and 19, on paragraph 44. The applicant discloses CIM data items, which are defined in the CIM Specification v2.2 and Schema v2.4 as well known in the art.

With respect to Claim 16, its limitation is similar to Claim 3 limitation and hence its rejection can be found therein.

With respect to Claim 17, its limitation is similar to Claim 4 limitation and hence its rejection can be found therein.

With respect to Claim 18, its limitation is similar to Claim 5 limitation and hence its rejection can be found therein.

With respect to Claim 19, its limitation is similar to Claim 6 limitation and hence its rejection can be found therein.


With respect to Claim 20, the limitation of “a central repository electronically coupled with the at least a first processor, the central repository configured to store the generated configuration record” is met on column 3, lines 46-49 and on column 6, lines 2-9.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tracey Akpati whose telephone number is 703-305-7820. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.30am-6.00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 703-305-4393. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

OTA


A. U 2135